UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,016	02/28/2007	Mads Hald Andersen	ANDERSEN8	7719
1444 7590 07/07/2009 BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.				
624 NINTH ST		YU, MISOOK		
SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1642	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Comments	10/580,016	ANDERSEN ET AL.	ANDERSEN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	MISOOK YU	1642		
The MAILING DATE of this communi Period for Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addres	SS	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MADE IS LONGER, FROM THE MADE IS LONGER, FROM THE MADE IS STATED IN THE PROPERTY OF THE IS A STATED IN T	AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a unication. Itutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO will, by statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this commu		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	d on 28 February 2007			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2b) This action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition f	<i>′</i> —	tters, prosecution as to the me	rits is	
closed in accordance with the practic	·	•		
Disposition of Claims	, , ,	,		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-75 and 81-83</u> is/are pendi	ing in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ar	•			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	e withdrawn from consideration.			
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are rejected.				
8) Claim(s) <u>1-75 and 81-83</u> are subject	to restriction and/or election requir	omont		
o) Claim(s) 1-75 and 67-65 are subject	to restriction and/or election requir	ement.		
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any object	tion to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	ınce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	the correction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	.121(d).	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-1	52.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
2. Certified copies of the priority of3. Copies of the certified copies of	documents have been received. documents have been received in a of the priority documents have been nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Staç	ge	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P' 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	TO-948) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 		

Application/Control Number: 10/580,016 Page 2

Art Unit: 1642

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Group I, claim(s) 1-65, drawn to vaccine composition comprising nucleic acid or protein, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1
- II. claim(s) 66, drawn to method of detecting cancer using a kit comprising a peptide, classified in class 436, subclass 501

Claims 67 and 70 link(s) inventions III and IV. The restriction requirement among the linked inventions is **subject to** the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 67 and 70. Upon the indication of allowability of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions **shall** be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be

that require all the limitations of an allowable linking claim will be entered as a

rejoined and fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104 Claims

matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance,

whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37

CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Applicant(s) are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, the allowable linking claim, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is

withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

- III. Claim 68, drawn to antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
- IV. Claim 69, drawn to T cell receptor, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- V. Claims 71-75, drawn to method of treating using vaccine, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
- VI. Claims 81 and 82 drawn to a method of monitoring, classified in class 435, subclass 7.23.
- VII. Claim 83, drawn to T-cell, classified in class 435, subclass 325.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and (II, V, VI) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of either group II, V, or VI.

Inventions III, IV and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant

case, the different inventions are different products with different structures and biological properties.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/580,016 Page 5

Art Unit: 1642

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species.

- 1) nucleic acid, protein, peptide, antigen presenting cells (APCs) comprising nucleic acid or APCs comprising protein or peptide.
- Bcl-2, Bcl-w, Mcl-1, Bfl- 1/A1, Bcl-b, Bcl2-L-10, Bcl-XL, Bax, Bok/Mtd, Bad, Bik/Nbk, Bid, Hrk/DP5, Bim, Noxa, Bmf, PUMA/bbc3, any one of SEQ ID Nos 1-11, or 42, 43, 45-50, 58, 60, 62-64.
- 3) One species of HLA molecule in the claims.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Page 6

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species from each of the three genuses for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at

the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

Art Unit: 1642

<u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MISOOK YU whose telephone number is 571-272-0839. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 A.M. to 5:30 P.M., every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/580,016 Page 9

Art Unit: 1642

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MISOOK YU Primary Examiner Art Unit 1642

/MISOOK YU/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1642